



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/682,968	11/02/2001	Hans-Ulrich Demuth	20488-26DIV	3916

21710 7590 06/03/2003

BROWN, RUDNICK, BERLACK & ISRAELS, LLP.
BOX IP, 18TH FLOOR
ONE FINANCIAL CENTER
BOSTON, MA 02111

EXAMINER

MELLER, MICHAEL V

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

1654

DATE MAILED: 06/03/2003

//

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Advisory Action

Application No.

09/682,968

Applicant(s)

DEMUTH ET AL.

Examiner

Michael V. Meller

Art Unit

1654

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

THE REPLY FILED 05 May 2003 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE. Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to avoid abandonment of this application. A proper reply to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) a timely filed amendment which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee); or (3) a timely filed Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.

PERIOD FOR REPLY [check either a) or b)]

- a) ☒ The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date of the final rejection.
- b) ☐ The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection. ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

1. ☐ A Notice of Appeal was filed on _____. Appellant's Brief must be filed within the period set forth in 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 1.191(d)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal.
2. ☒ The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered because:
- (a) ☒ they raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
- (b) ☐ they raise the issue of new matter (see Note below);
- (c) ☐ they are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or
- (d) ☐ they present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: See Continuation Sheet.

3. ☐ Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): _____.
4. ☐ Newly proposed or amended claim(s) _____ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).
5. ☒ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☒ request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: See Continuation Sheet.
6. ☐ The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered because it is not directed SOLELY to issues which were newly raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.
7. ☒ For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment(s) a) ☒ will not be entered or b) ☐ will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.

The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:


Claim(s) allowed: none.

Claim(s) objected to: _____.

Claim(s) rejected: 1-11.

Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: _____.

8. ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is a) ☐ approved or b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
9. ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s). _____
10. ☐ Other: _____


Michael V. Meller
Primary Examiner
Art Unit: 1654

Continuation of 2. NOTE: by adding, "raising the blood sugar level in a mammal having hypoglycemia" raises new issues since now the claim must be searched with respect to the patient specifically having the condition and it does not read on any and all patients anymore. The use of the word "influencing" raises new issues since it is not clear what this term means and the specification teaches inhibiting the activity of the enzyme but "influencing" of it is not supported by the instant specification. While the specification may mention such language, one of ordinary skill in the art would not know what is meant by "influencing" since such a term could mean just about anything

Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: of the reasons of record. Applicant has argued that "effectors" and "influencing" clearly are enabled and define the invention but there is support for the words but their meaning is so unclear. To "influence" or "effect" something is so subjective and to say an enzyme's activity has been influenced or effected is not evidence that the method of the invention will be carried out. Applicant has shown on the record only that inhibiting the activity of the enzyme will work in the claimed method, but there is no support in the specification that the enzyme activity will be effected or influenced and that will then raise the blood sugar level in a mammal having hypoglycemia. The art of biotechnology has a very high level of unpredictability and for applicant to show that inhibiting the enzyme will accomplish the claimed method and then expect one of ordinary skill in the art to expect that influencing and effecting the activity of the enzyme will also work in the claimed method to treat the condition is simply not supported by the instant specification. Further, applicant did not supply the copy of the article to show the term effectors in use as applicant alleges.